

AGENDA

Comparison of the two “proposals” that were generated in response to the director’s charge for Proton Driver Study II.

1. Give a brief overview of the proposal and how it responds to the specifications stated in the charge to the study (max 3 slides/max 5 min).
Comment: Most committee members will not be familiar with either the charge or the proposal.
2. Summarize the proposal cost (max 1 slide/max 2 min).
3. Summarize how the proposal would respond to a different (higher or lower) specification of the beam energy or intensity (max 1 slide/max 2 min).
Comment: In particular, discuss the “constraints” that were assumed in developing the proposal and how the proposal could be made more attractive if the constraints were relaxed. It may be appropriate to discuss requirements for repitition rate and beam emittance at this point also.
4. Describe one or more staging scenarios where each stage consists of the smallest possible step (lowest cost) that results in improved beam performance or reliability. (max 2 slides/5 min)
5. Describe the top 3 technical uncertainties (either cost or performance) and a guess as to what the worst-case scenario might be. Outline the R&D plan to mitigate the risk. (max 2 side/5 min)
6. Describe possible upgrade paths. In particular, address the question of an upgrade to a higher power proton source (2 MW, 5 MW, 10 MW—anything that seems reasonable.) (max 1 slide/2 min)
7. Compare and contrast the strengths and weaknesses of both proposals (max 2 slides/5 min).